



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,188	08/27/2001	Dongming Jiang	25961-706	3518

21971 7590 10/06/2003

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 943041050

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/940,188

Applicant(s)

JIANG ET AL.

Examiner

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2002 and 21 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 24 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification. Also, It is noted that the claims cited in the Supplemental Preliminary Amendment (filed on 12/17/2001) do not contain line numbers. For ease of reference by both Examiner and Applicant all future correspondence should include the recommended line numbering.

Claim Objections

Claim 24 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim 12 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a typing/grammar error of the word "relevances". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430).

As to claims 1, 3, 5 and 10, Brady et al. (hereinafter referred as Brady) discloses a method of focused crawling, comprising:

a) accessing a query input [e.g. the Front-End component (108), Fig. 1; col. 15, lines 14-19; Fig. 8];

b) crawling a plurality of documents via the guidance of a crawl metric [e.g., the Retrieval Priority List, col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 1; col. 5, lines 9-11], wherein the crawl metric is partially determined by a first mechanism [e.g. the ranking mechanism applied to the content of Retrieved Priority List; col. 5, lines 3-5] via the steps of: 1) evaluating the relevance of documents using logical expression of keywords and phrases [e.g., the subject taxonomy processing applied to the example documents stored in the retrieval priority list, col. 5, lines 41-47; Fig. 11]; 2) evaluating relevance of documents using a

template [e.g. a Web page template, col. 4, lines 1-11] which contains at least one template portion and the portion contains at least one level [e.g. the fields in the document, col. 4, lines 30-32]; 3) evaluating relevance of documents using a link structure of the crawled documents [e.g. the Retrieval Priority List is a linked structure, col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 1; col. 5, lines 9-118]; 4) evaluating relevance based on freshness of documents [e.g., the Retrieval Priority List is repeatedly updated with fresh documents (i.e. the links) being added and the content of the Retrieval Priority List are repeatedly ranked according to their relevance to a subject taxonomy. Col. 5, lines 3-11; col. 8, lines 22-46; Fig. 5].

c) returning target documents based on a search metric which is determined by a second mechanism which repeats the steps of 1-4 of the first mechanism [e.g., see Fig. 11, the outer-loop processing mechanism (1106-1120) of unit 1112]. Wherein, the procedure, of the first mechanism, evaluating relevance of documents using a link structure of the crawled documents [e.g., the Retrieval Priority List (1114) is used by the inner-loop mechanism (1108-1116), Fig. 11];

d) accessing a first plurality of documents from a database of documents , wherein the documents including crawled documents which are ranked [e.g., col. 9, lines 10-42];

e) generating a graph of the first plurality of documents [e.g. the Taxonomy section (1301, Fig. 13) can be created via the creating a new directory or creating a new resource functions, col. 24, lines 5-19; col. 23, lines 32-40];

f) assigning weights to one or more nodes of the graph [e.g., the Score Page and Score links unit (806, Fig. 8)];

g) finding an assignment of weights to one or more nodes of the graph, by propagating weights through the graph, the assignment of weight to a node partially based on calculating a weighted sum of weights propagated from neighboring nodes [e.g., the steps 804-812, Fig. 8];

h) generating a ranked list which is partly generated from the graph [e.g., the steps 1106-1118, Fig. 11].

As to claims 2, 4, 6 and 11, the claimed feature – relevance includes importance is defaulted by the page ranking technique.

As to claims 7 and 12, Brady further discloses that the first mechanism including:
a) associates a weight to each of the evaluated relevance of the procedures [e.g. col. 22, lines 1-14]; b) combining the evaluated relevance and the weights of the evaluated relevance [col. 21, lines 56-65].

As to claims 8 and 13, Brady further discloses that the using of template for evaluating relevance includes at least one heading levels and content levels evaluating processing [e.g., col. 22, lines 44 - 46].

As to claims 9 and 14, Brady further discloses that the evaluation relevance includes evaluating relevance of a first document [e.g. a page] and the link which being used to refer the second plurality sets of documents [col. 21, line 37 – col. 22, line 29].

As to claims 15-20, Brady further discloses that the evaluation relevance processing can be done by expanding or shrinking the graph with a second set of one or more documents from the database via links of the document, in a forward and backward direction to produce the third set of document as claimed [col. 18, lines 32-48; the steps of 1301-1303, Fig. 13].

As to claim 21, Brady further discloses that the evaluation combining process is based on common characteristics of the nodes or relationships between the nodes [e.g. col. 21, lines 61-65].

As to claim 22, Brady further discloses that the weight propagating processing is done by a limited node distance [e.g. the limited threshold value, col. 22, lines 25-27].

As to claims 23 and 24, Brady further discloses that the weight assigned to a document includes at least one of the relevance of the document to the query input and importance of the document independent of the query input [e.g., col. 21, line 59 – col. 22, line 6].

Conclusion

4. To expedite the process of examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are as following: Huang et al. (US Patent No. 6,601,075) which discloses a system and method of ranking and retrieving documents based on authority scores of schemas and documents; Adar et al. (US Patent No. 6,493,702) which discloses a system and method for searching and recommending documents in a collection using share bookmarks.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on 7-4:30.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2171

8. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-6296.

Susan Chen

September 26, 2003



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2171